



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE.	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,621	04/02/2001	Harold Mattice	403120	1062
27717	7590	05/02/2007	EXAMINER	
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP 131 S. DEARBORN ST., SUITE2400 CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803			COBURN, CORBETT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/824,621	MATTICE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Corbett B. Coburn	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10 and 32-40 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 32-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 10 & 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luciano et al (US Patent Number 6,641,483) in view of Henry et al. (US Patent Number 5,774,058).

Claims 1, 32, 37: Luciano teaches an apparatus (Lockable Security Cabinet) for selectively controlling access to a plurality of physical areas of a gaming machine.

(Abstract) Luciano teaches a plurality electrically operable lock mechanisms respectively associated with the areas and each physically movable between unlocked and locked conditions with respect to its associated area. (Col 8, 19-21 teaches electronic locks. Fig 3 teaches a plurality of locks. Locks inherently move between a locked and unlocked position.) Clearly, the data input devices for the electronic locks would be located on the gaming device. Luciano teaches that it is important that certain identified personnel have access to some but not all of the plurality of physical areas of the gaming machine. (Col 1, 42-53) Luciano fails to teach the details of the operation of electronic locks. Henry teaches these details.

Henry teaches control circuitry (Fig 5) independent of the gaming machine including a processor (58) operating under control of a stored program (Fig 6) and coupled to each of the lock mechanisms via a communications link for controlling operation of the lock. This means that the input device is remote from the physical lock. Thus the apparatus remotely controls access. There is a data storage and retrieval system adapted to communicate with the processor and including a storage medium for storing data including personnel identification data and access authorization data indicative of the areas if any, of the machine for which a person seeking access to the machine is authorized. There is a data input device (keyboard – Fig 14) coupled to the processor for inputting at least personnel identification data (pin – Fig 10) identifying a person seeking access to an area of the machine. (Col 3, 22-24) The processor is responsive to compare personal identification data inputted by the user with data stored on the storage media for operating one or more lock mechanisms (Abstract) in accordance with access authorization corresponding to an identified person. (Fig 10) Clearly, a user may access one or more physical areas (i.e., a plurality of physical areas) of the machine without having access to all areas. The processor causes the lock mechanism of the physical areas to which access is authorized to move to the unlocked position to allow access to those physical areas – this is how all electronic locks work. (See Summary of the Invention for more information.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Luciano in view of Henry to include the circuitry and programming described in Henry in order to carry out Luciano's suggestion to use

electronic locks. The method of use is rendered obvious by the structure. Clearly a system that may be used on a single system may be used on a plurality of systems.

Regarding the newly added limitations, it would be ludicrous to assert that Luciano contemplates a situation in which there was only one system within a casino that required access control. Casinos typically have hundreds, perhaps thousands, of gaming machines. Clearly, each machine requires access control.

Furthermore, Luciano's teachings are applicable to any number of gaming machines. Luciano teaches that it is important to restrict access to the interior of gaming machines – certain people are authorized access to some locks, while forbidden access to others. Taken over a group of gaming machines, a certain person (e.g., a maintenance technician named Smith) may be authorized access to a certain lock or locks (e.g., Lock A & Lock B) on machines 1-10, but denied access to any other locks on those machines and any locks on any other machine. This is a logical implication of Luciano's teaching.

Henry teaches controlling multiple locks from a single location. Henry's device neither knows nor cares where these locks are. Henry teaches sending an actuation signal down a wire in response to the proper access identification – the physical location of the lock is immaterial. Henry's invention works equally well if the locks are attached to one gaming machine or one hundred. Certainly, it would make no sense to have a separate controller for each machine when one of Henry's can control access to several machines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Luciano in view of Henry to control access to several gaming machines (and portions of gaming machines) in order to apply Luciano's teachings

regarding the importance of access control to the multi-machine environment typical to most (if not all) casinos.

Claims 2, 4: Henry's data input device includes a keypad (Col 3, 25-27 & Fig 2, 22).

Claims 3, 33: Henry's data input device includes a key reader, which is essentially a card reader (the key stores information about the user – just like a card), the data storage and retrieval system including a personal data card assigned to a person seeking access to the machine and readable by the card reader. (Col 3, 11-14)

Claim 5: Luciano teaches one or more doors respectively associated with one or more areas and respectively provided with lock mechanisms, each door being movable between open and closed conditions. (Fig 3)

Claim 6: Each of Luciano's lock mechanisms directly controls access to its associated area.

Claim 7: Each door includes a manual latch, the lock mechanism for a door indirectly controlling access to the associated area by controlling enablement and disablement of the manual latch. This is how locks work. The lock mechanism (443) controls the enablement and disablement of a manual latch (locking tab 452). The locking tab actually holds the door shut – not the lock itself.

Claims 8, 35: Henry teaches a sensing apparatus for sensing the condition of each door and each lock mechanism. (Col 4, 49-52)

Claim 34: Henry teaches a remote control apparatus in communication with the processor for control thereof from a remote location. The keyboard is a remote control

apparatus that controls the processor from a location remote from the processor. The processor is remote from the locks.

Claim 10: Luciano teaches that at least one area includes a switch (242, etc), the associated lock mechanism enabling and disabling the switch. (Col 5, 50-54)

Claim 36: Henry teaches providing a manual override key for each lock mechanism and providing an indication when a lock mechanism has been manually operated. (Table 3)

Claims 38-40: Henry's lock has a solenoid with a plunger. (See discussion of Fig 5, 78.)
The plunger opens and closes to allow access.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 22 March 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. The arguments are drawn to the amended claims and are answered in the rejection above.

Conclusion

5. This is an RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/824,621. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3714

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corbett B. Coburn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4447. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30, Monday-Friday, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Art Unit: 3714

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



**CORBETT B. COBURN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Corbett B. Coburn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714